

Remarks

The Applicants have amended the Specification to place it into final condition for allowance. Entry into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. The Applicants note the Examiner's helpful comments concerning molecular weight. The Applicants have accordingly amended Claims 1-4 to recite that the molecular weight is "number-average" molecular weight. Support may be found on Page 19 of the Applicants' Specification and elsewhere. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by US Pub. '332. The Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful and detailed comments with respect to US Pub. '332. The Applicants nonetheless respectfully submit that US Pub. '332 fails to disclose, either explicitly or implicitly, all claimed aspects of Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17. Reasons are set forth in detail below.

The differences between Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17 and US Pub. '332 are quite straightforward. US Pub. '332 discloses a resin composition comprising a mixture of (A) a mixture of (a1) poly(lactic acid) and (a2) an aliphatic polyester, and (B) an aliphatic block co-polyester having a poly(lactic acid) segment and an aliphatic polyester segment. In other words, US Pub. '332 discloses a resin composition comprising a mixture of three distinct components, namely components (a1), (a2) and (B).

The Applicants' Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17 claim something quite different. Instead, the poly(lactic acid) polymer and a plasticizer having at least one poly(lactic acid) segment and a polyether segment. In other words, the Applicants' Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17 claim a poly(lactic acid) polymer composition having two distinct components. However, US Pub. '332 does not

disclose a polyether segment as one of those components. Thus, it becomes clear that US Pub. '332 discloses something quite different. As a consequence, the Applicants' films formed from the polymer composition of Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17 are neither disclosed explicitly nor implicitly by US Pub. '332. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-9, 11 and 13-17 under U.S.C. §102 based on US Pub. '332 be withdrawn.

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over US Pub. '332. The Applicants again note with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments applying US Pub. '332 to Claims 15 and 16. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the failures on the part of US Pub. '332 concerning the underlying independent claims applies to Claims 15 and 16.

In particular, the Applicants respectfully submit that US Pub. '332 fails to teach or suggest a resin composition comprising a polyether segment. Thus, US Pub. '332 is non-enabling as prior art against Claims 15 and 16. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 15 and 16 is accordingly respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:lh
(215) 656-3381